



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                               | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.             | CONFIRMATION NO.            |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 10/032,849                                    | 10/29/2001  | Sridatta Viswanath   | 5681-91000                      | 9025                        |
| 58467   | 7590        | 08/20/2009           |                                 |                             |
| MHKKG/SUN<br>P.O. BOX 398<br>AUSTIN, TX 78767 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>EVANS, KIMBERLY L.  |                             |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>3629                | PAPER NUMBER                |
|   |             |                      | NOTIFICATION DATE<br>08/20/2009 | DELIVERY MODE<br>ELECTRONIC |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent\_docketing@intprop.com  
ptomhkg@gmail.com

|                              |                                      |   |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/032,849 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>VISWANATH ET AL. |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>KIMBERLY EVANS    | <b>Art Unit</b><br>3629                 |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 May 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Response to Amendments**

1. This action is in reply to the response received on May 20, 2009.
2. Claims 1, 4, 8-15, and 19 have been amended.
3. Claims 1-22 are currently pending and have been examined.
4. The rejections of claims 1-22 have been updated to reflect the amendments.
5. The Examiner has carefully reviewed the Applicant's response and has determined that the rejection stands and is resubmitted below addressing the claims as modified by said amendments.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 3629

- a) Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- b) Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- c) Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- d) Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elmore et al., US Patent Application Publication No. US 2006/0059107 A1 in view of Grasso et al., US Patent Number 5,892,909.

9. With respect to Claims 1, 8, and 15,

Elmore discloses the following limitations:

- *displaying, by a client computer, a first page in a high order presentation language, (see at least Figure 11, paragraph 23: "...FIG. 11 is a pictorial diagram showing a sample page returned to the client via HTTP...") wherein the first page is associated with a form (see at least Figure 10, paragraph 22: "...FIG. 10 is a pictorial diagram showing a sample page wherein a user enters information to open a trouble ticket against a product in the hierarchy...") and*
- *in response to said receiving: generating, by the respective one of the plurality of providers, a second page in a high order presentation language; providing by the respective one of the plurality of providers, the second page to the client computer for display; (see at least paragraph 23: "...FIG. 11 is a pictorial diagram showing a sample page returned to the client via HTTP...")*
- *in response to said calling a corresponding render method and dependent on the performance of said action, said render method performing: populating a name value pair with corresponding data (see at least paragraph 70: "...Each CMI 105 is also mapped to source and target strategy classes 151/152. The interconnect service 136 uses the source*

strategy to build up the payload message associated with the CMI before being dispatched to the transport adapter 153. Payloads are of a specific message type, such as name/value pairs or an XML, message. Target strategies are used to update the system with data from inbound messages...”)

- *applying said name value pair populated with said data to a vehicle for displaying dynamic content on pages in a high order presentation language* (see at least paragraph 83: “... If a generic routing policy is used, the routing policy class performs a database lookup in the GENERIC\_CMI\_POLICY table to determine which adapter to use. This table associates the CMI with: (a) Adapter home, which is the JNDI-bound name of the adapter; (b) Context, which is used to determine how to translate the data into a format the external system expects. Examples of context include the handler class name, an email address, a fax number, or any information the adapter needs to pass on the message; (c) Payload, which determines the type of message being sent, such as a class name and OID, a name/value pair, or an XML, document. There is a payload constant for each payload type...”)
- *and drafting said second page.* (see at least paragraph 185: “...Instead, it bypasses the transition policy and directs the user to the destination page determined during the first execution of the policy (when the FLOW table was accessed). In this example, the next page would be page D. See Table 1.4. TABLE-US-00016 TABLE 1.4 Flow\_ID Page\_ID Page\_Order Flow1 A 1 Flow1 B 2 Flow1 C 3...”)

Elmore discloses all of the above limitations, Elmore does not distinctly disclose the following limitations, but Grasso however as shown discloses,

- *wherein said form is one of a plurality of forms, and wherein each of the plurality of forms is mapped to a respective provider of server-side processing deployed upon a server computer;*(see at column 30, lines 18-22: “...For a data form, on the other hand, the system maps the user data into a representation suitable for the transport. For MAPI transport, for instance, user data is mapped into one or more email attachments (i.e., whatever is needed to transmit the binary data)...”)

- *receiving, by the client computer, input indicating an action to be implemented on the first page (see at least column 29, lines 28-36: "...The corresponding MTA at the server (e.g., MAPI), in response, unpackages the transmitted form into a format understood by the server (i.e., an internal server form) and places it into the server's internal queue. At a high level, therefore, numerous incoming form-based messages arrive from various clients via the CRA module 1520 (which communicates with the server 1530 through an appropriate one of the server's message transport agents 1535)...")*
  - *wherein said generating comprises: calling a helper class method corresponding to said action*
  - *and a corresponding render method in response to said calling a helper class method, said helper class method performing said action*

(see at least column 34 Lines 29-46: "...the class provides "setter" and "getter" methods for supporting document objects. For instance, the Get.sub.-- Name method returns the name (text string) for the document. Get.sub.-- Vdepth, on the other hand, returns a number (long integer) indicating the version depth (i.e., how many versions are stored) for the document. In a similar manner, the class defines several helper methods for managing versions of the document, such as the Open Version method for opening an existing version. As shown, the methods are implemented as "virtual" methods--that is, no implementation steps are provided for the methods at this class level. The system is designed in this manner so that different storage mechanisms (e.g., ODBC) can be supported by the system, with each particular type having a corresponding Doc subclass providing necessary implementation steps...")

- *wherein at least one of said helper class method and said render method is re-usable in performing a subsequent action on a page (see at least column 31, lines 65-67: The AV List serves to manage a higher-level list... "; column 32, lines 7-12: "...For the type of information which flows in the forms, often there will exist like or similar information which needs to be stored and accessed iteratively, as well as be grouped in common segments*

Art Unit: 3629

in memory. A lot of the information stored at the server is repetitive--essentially existing as repeated types of information...")

- *a client computer and a server computer on which a plurality of providers of server-side processing are deployed; (see at least column 7, lines 21-27: "...Typically, IntraExpress.TM. would be deployed as separate IntraExpress.TM. server and client software components (i.e., running on separate computers), for implementing a "thin client/thick server" system. ...")*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the electronic business system of Elmore with the system and method for managing delivery of information to multiple users of Grasso because it is an efficient means for allowing users to manage the distribution and delivery of information across an enterprise Intranet, Internet, and common communication channels.

10. With respect to Claims 2, 7, 9,14, 17, and 22,

Elmore, and Grasso disclose all of the above limitations, Elmore further discloses:

- *said high order presentation language comprises HyperText Markup Language (HTML).*
- *said vehicle for displaying dynamic content on pages in a high order presentation language comprises a Java Server Page (JSP)*

(see at least paragraph 38: "...They use JavaServer Pages (JSP) technology--standard HTML files that contain blocks of simple Java code--to dynamically generate customer views 108...")

11. With respect to Claims 3, 10, and 18,

Elmore, and Grasso disclose all of the above limitations, Elmore further discloses:

- *wherein said first page, said second page, and said pages comprise HTML pages. (see at least paragraph 103: "...The eBusiness support system provides portals that are specific to a market segment of the communications industry. The Universal Agent Portal, Channel*

Partner Portal, and Small Business Portals all use: (1) JavaServer Pages (JSP) technology--these HTML pages with embedded Java source code allow for dynamic Web content; (2) Display policies--embedded within the JSP pages, these policies access and manipulate data for display; (3) A Web session controller 162--this servlet mediates the creation and display of JSP pages; (4) Transition policies 163--these Java files determine navigation logic through the site; and (5) Resource Bundles--the classes store display values or messages corresponding to codes in constant classes...")

12. With respect to Claims 4, 11, and 19,

Elmore, and Grasso disclose all of the above limitations, Elmore further discloses:

- *each of said plurality of providers of server-side processing comprises a servlet*

(see at least paragraph 103: "...3) A Web session controller 162--this servlet mediates the creation and display of JSP pages..."; paragraph 156: "...The Web session controller is a Java servlet that provides load balancing through a session-level, round-robin algorithm that weighs server load information and routes requests accordingly. This servlet also provides failover by replicating HTTP session information across nodes in a cluster, and maintains session state via a cookie-based session ID...")

13. With respect to Claims 5, 12, and 20,

Elmore, and Grasso disclose all of the above limitations, Elmore further discloses:

- *said form comprises a business form* (see at least paragraph 12: "...Each of the eBusiness Portals consists of a set of JavaServer Pages (JSPs) that allow for quick and easy changes to the presentation of the communications provider's portal by using standard Web development tools..."; paragraph 22: "...FIG. 10 is a pictorial diagram showing a sample page wherein a user enters information to open a trouble ticket against a product in the hierarchy...") In the referenced figure 10, the Examiner interprets a trouble ticket as a business form.



14. With respect to Claims 6, 13, and 21,

Elmore, and Grasso disclose all of the above limitations, Elmore further discloses:

- *said business form comprises a modality for performing an electronic commerce 'transaction'* (see at least paragraph 38: "...Presentation Layer 103, in which eBusiness portals provide communications specific functionality tailored to particular types of users, such as small businesses or resellers. These portals are eBusiness sites with interfaces and process flows dedicated to particular customer group. They use JavaServer Pages (JSP) technology--standard HTML files that contain blocks of simple Java code--to dynamically generate customer views 108. The JSP-based portal architecture enables the separation of the user interface from application logic, enabling the design of the page to change without altering the underlying content. Additional components of the portal architecture include a Web session controller, which maintains user session state, and page transition policies--Java classes that enforce page transition rules by accessing business functionality contained in the Smart Components 104..."; and Abstract: "...A smart component server provides the core services and comprehensive business process logic required to successfully conduct business online. The communications messaging interfaces integrate with back-office systems for functions such as billing, provisioning, and interconnection..."; paragraph 1: "...The invention relates to electronic commerce technology...")

15. With respect to Claim 16,

Elmore, and Grasso disclose all of the above limitations, Elmore further discloses:

- *said system is an electronic commerce system* (see at least Abstract: "...A comprehensive electronic business support system comprises three layers: (1) the business layer, including various smart components which unify data and business processes across all customer interactions; (2) the integration layer, including various communications messaging interfaces and enterprise application integration adapters, which provide a flexible, automated, and

process driven solution for integrating across business applications and operations support systems; and (3) the presentation layer, including various customer views, which are presented via particular business portals. A smart component server provides the core services and comprehensive business process logic required to successfully conduct business online. The communications messaging interfaces integrate with back-office systems for functions such as billing, provisioning, and interconnection..."; paragraph 1: "...The invention relates to electronic commerce technology...")

### **Response to Arguments**

16. Applicant's arguments received on May 20, 2009 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
17. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to **Kimberly L. Evans** whose telephone number is **571.270.3929**. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **John Weiss** can be reached at **571.272.6812**.
18. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair> <<http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866.217.9197** (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed to: **Commissioner of**

Art Unit: 3629

**Patents and Trademarks**, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 or faxed to **571-273-8300**. Hand delivered responses should be brought to the **United States Patent and Trademark Office Customer Service Window**: Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

/KIMBERLY EVANS/Examiner, Art Unit 3629

/JOHN G. WEISS/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629